

Regina, Nov. 26th, 1905.

Dear Brother Editor:-

I am sending you a copy of my little pamphlet, on the SCHOOL QUESTION. Should you publish any extracts or make any comment, kindly send me a marked copy, and very greatly oblige.

Yours very truly,

J. K. McInnis.

The School Question

Supplement to The Regina Standard



To meet the very great demand for extra copies of our Daily, Semi-Weekly and Weekly editions containing the "Pedagogical Prodigy" series of articles, answering Mr. Calder on the School Question, we have found it necessary to republish them in this form. The one aim of the editor has been to strip away the confusing verbiage of extraneous matter with which Mr. Calder has cunningly attempted to mystify the main issue. We have therefore tried to place it before our readers in plainest terms. A great wrong is being imposed, with appalling boldness, and my earnest hope is that a perusal of these pages may lead to fuller realization of the truth.

J. K. MCINNIS.

The School Question

Supplement to the Regina Standard.

No. I.

"Hon." James Alexander Calder, the gentleman whom "Premier" Walter Scott discovered (studying law) in a "stuffy little back room" of the Michaelis block, and upon whom he placed the label "Minister of Education," is, to borrow a phrase from Bret Harte, "an amoozin individual." Immediately that he was brought into the fierce light that beats upon a new provincial ministry, he budded and blossomed in one night as an authority not only on educational affairs, but also on the most intricate questions of constitutional law. But it is all blossoms thus far. The almonds are not yet in evidence.

This pedagogical prodigy was given his trial heat before the Liberal Convention, where he extolled the present school "system." During the course of his somewhat rambling disquisition, Mr. Calder carefully aimed to hide the fact that all the best features of the

present school law are the result of local legislation and regulation, which Mr. Haultain brought to bear upon the "system" after he obtained control and became the official head of the educational department.

We shall deal fully with that phase as we proceed. We shall show that a fairly good "system" has been evolved, not because of the sectarian clauses which Federal authority forced into it, but in the face of that hindrance.

MR. CALDER'S ESSAYS.

Just now let us follow up the evolution of the prodigy. We next find Mr. Calder in the columns of the leading coercion organs, with a series of "hurriedly prepared" articles setting forth, to use his own words, "the chief considerations and circumstances which induced the Federal Parliament to make provision in our provincial constitution for the continuation of

the existing school system." We were under the impression that Sir Wilfrid Laurier, leader of the parliamentary majority, had gone fully into those "reasons" when he introduced the bill in the House of Commons. We did not think it remained for Premier Scott's Minister to amplify what the Prime Minister of Canada had given by way of excuse for refusing to grant the new provinces a free hand. Sir Wilfrid's one great reason is spread upon the pages of Hansard, and emphatically asserts that the outcome of the national school system in the United States is **LYNCHINGS, DIVORCES, and MURDERS.** We shall deal later on with that libel upon our American cousins and their non-sectarian schools. At present we are following up the trail of "Minister" Calder, the pedagogical prodigy. His school question essay, in three parts is now being circulated in pamphlet form. The Northwest Baptist has had it under review, and sums it up as "a vain attempt to reconcile the autonomy legislation with law, with practical wisdom, and with professed Liberal principles." This same authority calls Mr. Calder an apologist, and points to the fact that his pamphlet does not come within speaking distance of the real point at issue. We heartily endorse that opinion, and we hope to confirm it in the mind of every thoughtful reader before we get through with our own analysis of the subject.

We are glad to find our task simplified in some measure by the issuance of a revised and condensed edition of the Calder pamphlet—a sort of shorter catechism which he has prepared for the benefit of those who could not find time to wade through the more labored publication in which he essayed to interpret the motives and inten-

tions of the prime conspirators. Mr. Calder's new version is in the form of a letter to his opponent in South Regina. It is, however, clearly intended as a campaign document. It represents Mr. Calder's best thought boiled down. The Standard is pleased to get it in that form, so that we can conveniently lay it before our readers.

THE LETTER.

Regina, Oct. 10, 1905.

James Hawkes, Esq.,
Balgonie, Sask.:

Dear Sir,—In certain portions of the constituency of South Regina, I find that your supporters, either with or without your knowledge and consent, are circulating mis-statements, and in some cases absolute falsehoods regarding our present school system. As it is the wish of every elector that the issues of the campaign should be placed squarely and honestly before the people, I must ask you to acknowledge publicly and frankly that the following is an absolutely true statement of our school system and otherwise point out wherein it is not.

(1) All schools in the province are under full state control. There are no schools controlled by any church. The Government demands that every school shall be conducted in exactly the same manner. Consequently every child in the province has absolutely the same right and the same opportunity to acquire exactly the same education as every other child.

(2) The Government prescribes one course of studies for all schools. Exactly the same subjects are taught in all schools.

(3) The same text books are used in every school. Some years ago Mr. Haultain allowed the so-called separate schools to

make use of two primary readers for infant classes, but as they are old books, out of date, they are not used.

(4) The teachers in all schools pass the same examinations, and are required to attend the one State Normal School.

(5) The Government Inspector visits all schools alike and requires them to submit to the same tests and examinations.

(6) There are no parochial schools. Every child is compelled to attend a state school, and consequently the state has full control over the education of the child.

(7) There are only five (5) so-called separate schools out of a total of nearly 900 in the whole Province. There is no demand for such schools, as all are state schools.

(8) Mr. Haultain is in favor of our present schools system as is shown by the following statement which he made: "The present system has been worked out as we found it, and there is no indication that the province would desire to change it. I am satisfied with the way it is working out. If I were made dictator tomorrow, I would not change it."

As regards the Provincial Rights cry, in so far as it affects our school system, it is due to the public that you should at once give a definite, frank and full reply to each of the following questions:

(1) Is the following the main provision of Section 93 of the Canadian constitution: "In and for each Province the Legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provision: Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any

right or privilege with respect to denominational schools, which any class of persons have by law in the Province at the union?"

(2) Are not the provisions of Sec. 93 applicable to every province in Canada? If not, why not? And to what provinces are they applicable?

(3) When was Saskatchewan taken into Canada as a province?

(4) Had we a separate school system "by law in the province at the union"?

(5) Is the following the main provision of Sec. 17 of our Provincial constitution: "In and for the Province of Saskatchewan the Legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education subject and according to the following provision: Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to separate schools which any class of persons have at the date of the passing of this Act, under the terms of Chapters 29 and 30 of the ordinances of the Northwest Territories, passed in the year 1901, or with respect to religious instruction in any public or separate schools as provided for in the said ordinances?"

(6) What is the difference between Sec. 17 of our Provincial constitution and Sec. 93 of the Canadian constitution? Is it not merely a substitution of the names of our school laws in the place of the vague term "by law"?

(7) Are you satisfied with our present school system? If not which change do you wish to have made?

(8) Are you in favor of the abolition of the so-called separate schools?

(9) If the so-called separate schools are not abolished by the

first Legislature, can they afterwards be abolished?

(10) If the Haultain party should be endorsed by the people by what steps or means will it get a test case before the courts?

(11) And when it gets the legal opinion it is so anxious to get, what does it intend to do with it?

These are matters in which every elector has an interest, and unless you see fit to publicly reply to the questions asked, over your own signature, it must be taken for granted that the campaign of deceit which is being carried on in South Regina in your behalf meets with your approval.

Yours truly,

(Signed) J. A. CALDER.

THE REPLY.

J. A. Calder, Esq.,
Minister of Education,
Regina.

Dear Sir,—

I beg to acknowledge receipt of your interesting letter of October 10, and I can assure you that I am as anxious as you can possibly be that the issues of the campaign should be placed "squarely" and "honestly" before the people. The main issue as I understand it, is the reference to the Privy Council of the several questions which you have proposed to me. It seems quite reasonable that you and myself cannot settle them, as they have already baffled all the learning of the leading constitutional lawyers in Canada, both in Parliament and out of it.

I cannot, of course, assume the responsibility for the opinions of others; neither do I propose to confirm or deny the statements which I have not heard, and which are merely alleged by

yourself to have been made. I have offered to meet you fairly and squarely upon the platform, but you do not seem to want it that way. I shall therefore have to decline your dictum as to the manner in which I shall present my views to those who kindly nominated me, as well as to the electors of South Regina in general.

I presume the test case will be taken before the courts somewhat in the same way that different provinces have taken their test cases in the past. What we shall do with the opinion when rendered, must depend, of course, upon what the opinion may be. The one great question is that the Federal authorities have deprived us of our birthrights in respect to our lands and school funds. The Provincial Righters contend that Parliament has acted unconstitutionally. You want to argue the constitutional question out with me, and I want it sent to the highest court in the empire that it may be settled squarely and honestly for all time to come. What more do you want?

Yours truly,

J. B. HAWKES,

Balgonie, Oct. 11th, 1905.

Mr. Hawkes did not answer Mr. Calder according to his folly. Nevertheless he has answered him cleverly. He has brought him straight to the real issue which Mr. Calder is endeavoring to evade or to obscure behind allegations and deductions which are not founded upon truth, and which will not stand the test of investigation.

The Standard purposes to apply that test. The editor of this paper is familiar with the question of Provincial Rights as related to each and every province of the en-

tire Dominion. We shall show that Mr. Calder is not only begging the issue, but mis-stating the facts. Under the pretext of a burning desire to spread truth he weaves together a cunningly devised fable and imputes falsehood to others whom he does not name, and who, most probably, exist only in the region of his terrified imagination. It is the old cry of "stop thief" but the real culprit has been detected and is now upon the pillory of public opinion.

No. II.

A CAMPAIGN OF DECEIT.

Mr. Scott's new Minister of Education submits what he calls an "absolutely true" statement of our schools system that—

(a) All schools are under full state control.

(b) The same prescribed subjects are taught in all schools.

(c) The same text books are used.

(d) The qualification of teachers is uniform.

(e) There is uniform inspection.

One would almost suppose from this presentation of the case that all reference to separate schools had been erased from the ordinances of the Northwest Territories, and the national system introduced. But when we turn to the law itself we find in it full provision for separate schools. Beginning at section 41 we find an arbitrary separation or distinction by which all the ratepayers are classified as "Protestants" or "Roman Catholics." To be a ratepayer is to belong to one or the other of these classifications. If you have any earthly possession at all you are a ratepayer, and if you are a ratepayer you are either a Protestant or a Roman Catholic in spite of yourself. You cannot be any other kind of Catholic. You must be "Roman" and your money must go to propagate that faith. If you say

you are not a Roman Catholic then, presto, you are changed into a sound Protestant. You are either a sheep or a goat. The "system" says so. Why did Mr. Haultain introduce and cause to be passed such legislation as that? **MR. HAULTAIN DID NOT!**

The sectarian clause was contained in the first school enactment of the old Northwest Council, and has been ever since retained in all our educational enactments. How then did the framers of the first Territorial school ordinance adopt that dual system? **IT WAS THRUST UPON THEM.**

In 1875, exactly thirty years ago, the Dominion Parliament sitting at Ottawa, passed the Northwest Territories Act, establishing provisional government in Assiniboia, Saskatchewan and Alberta. Section 11 of that act compelled the Territorial Government to maintain the Separate School system. Now a "system" may be good or bad according to its development and operation. And how did this "ideal" system operate before Mr. Haultain took hold of it and controlled it as a department of his government?

We propose to prove conclusively that the conditions were exactly the very reverse of what Mr. Cal-

der claims to be the more recent state of affairs. Then if the operations and results of the system differed widely at different periods in the past, what guarantee have we that a comparatively efficient status to which Mr. Haultain brought it is going to be maintained? A system that yields diametrically opposite results at different times must be very elastic. It may be ideal under the control of a faithful and firm Haultain, or it may relapse to its former state under the time-serving administration of a Calder or a Scott. And this elastic system is the one which is proposed to be perpetuated, and which the autonomy bill fastens upon us forever, if we are prepared to submit to federal imposition in matters that are clearly within the scope of provincial jurisdiction.

Does Mr. Calder not know that only a short time ago we had a two-headed board of education controlling this boasted system? Were the subjects exactly the same then, and did every child receive the "same education as every other child?" Did the teachers pass the same examinations? Has Minister Calder (late Deputy Minister) made a complete study of the question before undertaking to enlighten the public on the excellencies of the "system"? Here is a third class examination paper, set for candidates for teachers' certificates under the "system" and sent out from Regina to the presiding examiners:

1. Give a definition of sin in its different species.
2. How is sin remitted in its different degrees?
3. What are our obligations under the 7th commandment.
4. What are the marks of the true church?
6. Give the doctrine of the Sacrament of Confirmation.

6. Give the doctrine of the Sacrament of Extreme-Unction.

7. What is the doctrine on the Infallibility of the Pope?

8. What does the Immaculate Conception of Mary mean?

The Standard, with all due reverence, adds a few more questions to this list and asks:—

What percentage of marks can John Alexander Calder take on that paper?

Will Mr. Calder say in the face of the foregoing examination paper that our schools always were, are now and ever shall be "under full state control, with uniformity in text books, in examinations, inspections, etc.?"

It is an evasion of the issue to point to present conditions, and to stop there. It is also a delusion.

Question: Who changed the conditions?

Answer: Haultain!

Q. Has the "system" changed?

A. No, the autonomy bill continues it with increased force and seeks to fasten it upon us forever.

Q. Could Scott and Calder alter the Haultain regulations in respect of separate schools?

A. They could, undoubtedly. The separate schools cannot be "PRE-JUDICIALLY" affected. Their privileges may be enlarged but they cannot be curtailed.

What do these facts show in relation to Mr. Calder? Simply this: That the new Minister is endeavoring to embellish a bad system with Mr. Haultain's good work. Does that harmonise with Mr. Calder's professed desire to place the issues "squarely and honestly" before the people? Does it not rather suggest the fable of the jackdaw parading himself in the borrowed and therefore ill-fitting plumage of a more noble bird? Or perhaps the wolf in sheep's clothing is a better simile.

Mr. Calder can take his choice. Our duty is to strip him of his disguise so that the people may see for themselves who it is that is really attempting to carry on a "campaign of deceit."

No. III.

HOW HAULTAIN-WORKED IT OUT.

Mr. Calder in his thesis on the school question tells us that there is uniformity of inspection. He surely remembers the time when our school inspectors were Roman Catholic priests and Protestant preachers. He knows that the "system" has not changed since then, and he knows also that the uniformity upon which he founds his argument is not because of the "system," but in spite of it. No one knows better than Mr. Calder that clerical influence was exerted strongly to retain dual inspection and to prevent the uniform training of teachers in the Normal school. He knows too, that at the earliest suitable opportunity, the same tireless and incessant influence will be exercised to change the Haultain restrictions. There is nothing in the "system" to prevent it, if we allow the equivocating Calder to usurp the position so ably filled by Mr. Haultain, as the official head of our educational affairs.

Mr. Calder is refreshingly candid betimes. Like one of Hudibras' characters —

So little does he understand
The dreadful game he has in hand;
He gets his head into a noose
Whilst trying to play both fast and loose.

In number seven of his theorems he tells us there is no demand for separate schools. Why then does he lend his ponderous aid to those who are endeavoring to fasten that

system upon us in perpetuity? Why imperil our peace, progress and prosperity in the effort to force upon the people something for which there is no popular demand? If Mr. Haultain, in the face of clerical opposition and Federal imposition, has so transformed the separate school system that there is no longer any demand for it, why not leave the new provinces free to implement the public desire? If the schools are practically state schools why not let them be state schools in reality? Is Mr. Calder in earnest, or is he merely trying to sugar-coat the pill?

Mr. Calder makes much ado about some words attributed to Mr. Haultain by an eastern interviewer. We do not know that Mr. Haultain is correctly reported, but for the present, we will take the quotation as given.

The present system is working out as we found it, and there is no indication that the province would desire to change it. I am satisfied with the way it is WORKING OUT. If I were made dictator tomorrow I would not change it.

Mr. Haultain evidently thought it easier to WORK IT OUT than to change it. And so he took the system as he found it, and proceeded to "work it out." He had pretty nigh succeeded before he got "worked out" himself. When Mr. Calder lost confidence in him the separate schools had almost reach-

ed the vanishing point. Haultain was working it out. He gradually created a preference for uniformity until, according to the excellent testimony of Mr. Calder himself, there is now "no demand" for the separate system. Let us see how Mr. Haultain "worked it out." In 1888 there were 28 Roman Catholic schools in a total of 131. In 1898 they had been reduced to 14 in a total of 426, and today there are but 3 in a total of 900 in Saskatchewan alone. Is it any wonder that Mr. Haultain was satisfied with such "working out" as that? We can imagine a merry glint in his eye whilst relating to the reporter how he took the system as he found it, and proceeded to work it out.

It is very evident that Mr. Haultain's "working out" the separate

school system was observed in Quebec. The "dead hand" has been laid upon him. He has been deposed. Messrs Scott and Calder have been "called" to "work in" again those sectarian features which had been almost fully eliminated. To make assurance doubly sure the Autonomy Act goes farther than did the Act of 1875, and stipulates that separate schools shall participate in all money grants on equal footing with the public schools. Why did not Mr. Scott persuade Sir Wilfrid that there was no demand for such enactment?

Ah, yes! There is a strong and insatiable demand for separate schools, but it is not the people of the new provinces who are making the demand.

No. IV.

TWO QUESTIONS AND THE ANSWERS.

Having already dealt with the theorems of the provisional Minister of Education for Saskatchewan we now turn to his problems. These, as Mr. Hawkes very properly points out, contain the crux of the entire controversy. Hon. Clifford Sifton despaired of his own ability to convince Parliament on the constitutional features of the issue. And yet we are to believe that James Alexander Calder knows all about it! This pedagogical prodigy issued, with charlatanic gusto, a challenge to a plain farmer, to discuss with him the knotty points of argument which the Provincial Rights party desire to be referred to the highest constitutional court of this British Empire. It was pure bluff, coupled

with a very palpable willingness to mislead and confuse honest electors, whose opportunities for studying law were less favorable than his own.

The law, when read in the light of the circumstances surrounding its creation, is plain enough. But Mr. Calder, in common with other coercionists, is endeavoring to read new meanings into it, to suit his case. That, of course, is an old trick, and is not, therefore, any mark of originality. His questions overlap each other badly, and hence it is difficult to deal with them separately and concisely. We shall for that reason, be obliged to take them in order and form in which they are presented:

(1) Is the following the main

provision of Section 93 of the Canadian constitution: "In and for each Province the Legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provision: Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools, which any class of persons have by law in the Province at the union."

Yes. And the provision shows very clearly that the intent of it is to establish provincial supremacy in educational affairs. The language used is most emphatic. The Legislature may EXCLUSIVELY make laws relating to education. That right is conferred upon Saskatchewan and Alberta by the Parliament of Great Britain, but the Parliament of Canada steps in arbitrarily to prevent the exercise of it—in other words, they take away from us what the Great Mother Parliament conferred upon each and all the provinces. But say Mr. Scott and Mr. Calder—there's a limitation. So there is! But how can that limitation apply to the new provinces, seeing that the power itself has been withheld? How can limitation be placed on a power which is not possessed? The power must first be ours EXCLUSIVELY. Give us it. Do not impose the limitation upon us in advance! If it applies to us and we disobey it, a remedy is already provided within the original constitution. The remedial power is vested in the Dominion Parliament but it becomes a farce if the provincial hands are to be first tied. The very existence of the remedial power argues in itself that all school law shall originate "in the province."

(2) Are not the provisions of Sec. 93 applicable to every prov-

ince in Canada. If not, why not? And to what provinces are they applicable?

In the humble opinion of The Standard, the "main provision" cited by Mr. Calder in No. 1, is applicable to every province. The language is plain. "In and for EACH province the Legislature may EXCLUSIVELY make laws relating to education. That's the main provision. The sub-clause applies specifically to Ontario and Quebec, the only two provinces which had denominational schools "at the union." Separate schools were not imposed upon them. They were the result of a mutual agreement entered into by the two provinces long before the passing of the Confederation Act, of which Section 93 is part. The limitation was not intended for provinces which had not voluntarily established denominational schools, for the very obvious reason that it could not apply to them. British Columbia, Manitoba, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island are free. Ontario and Quebec tied themselves up, and the former has been sorry for it ever since. At the instance of the latter a bold—in fact, a most impudent attempt is made to deprive Alberta and Saskatchewan of their constitutional freedom, and to coerce them into submission. And it is indeed humiliating to see men of good possibilities lending themselves to so nefarious an undertaking, one by which their memory, in so far as it may not be forgotten, must be held in utter execration.

We hope we have answered questions one and two to Mr. Calder's satisfaction. We expect to be able to include Nos. 3. and 4 within the compass of the next chapter.

MORE QUESTIONS ANSWERED.

(3) When was Saskatchewan taken into Canada as a province?

The original Northwest Province or Territory, of which the present Saskatchewan was a part, entered the union in 1870, immediately upon the abrogation of the Hudson Bay Company's claims. Saskatchewan, as now constituted, attained its status on Sept. 1st, 1905.

(4) Had we a separate school system "by law in the province at the union"?

Assuredly we had no separate school system "at the union" in 1870. And that is certainly the date at which the Great Lone Land passed from the hands of a company that had held it for 200 years, by Imperial charter, and became part and parcel of the Dominion of Canada. That is the date, Mr. Calder, in our opinion, and we are glad to know that we have the concurrence of Mr. Hawkes, to whom you first proposed the question. We fear it does not suit your purpose, but as you are a minister of education, seeking frank and full information, and as these are matters of interest to every elector we feel bound to give correct information even at the risk of disappointing you. The Northwest Province, we repeat, entered the union in 1870, and there was no separate school system in the province "at the union," by law or otherwise. Convinced against your will you may still hold to your own opinion. We do not force you to accept ours. We are no coercionists. What we ask

in the name of the people is that you quit aiding coercion, and abide the decision of the constitutional tribunal.

The granting of provincial autonomy, or the sub-dividing of a large province into several provinces could not alter the date of union. Manitoba received provincial endowment in 1870. Some years later her status was changed by the granting of better terms. She obtained fuller rights and powers, but that fact did not alter her date of union, when her school question cropped up. A large portion of the remaining territory, viz., Assiniboia, Alberta and Saskatchewan obtained a measure of provincial autonomy in 1875. The rights of self-government then given have been enlarged from time to time until 1905, when an entirely new bill has been introduced and passed. But how could either of these dates be counted the date of union, any more than some future date, when the Act may be again amended or repealed? And there are still yet large areas of this western country under Federal control, though lacking provincial autonomy. Will Mr. Calder and his fellow-coercionists contend that Athabasca, Mackenzie, Keewatin, Franklin and Ungava have not yet entered the union? Will they say that the Yukon, which sends a representative to Parliament is not yet in the union, or that Saskatchewan and Alberta, having had representation at Ottawa for nearly twenty years, did not enter the union until 1905?

The date at which any particular

portion of this Dominion entered the union is not an unknown quantity to be sought out algebraically. The whole is greater than its part, and is equal to the sum of its parts. We may remark parenthetically that Blackstone is not our authority, but perhaps the minister will accept the axiom as it stands. The Northwest Province came into the union as a whole in 1870. Its parts came in with it, whether of past, present or future subdivision.

A province may be very small as is the case with Prince Edward Island, or quite large, as was the "Province of Canada" before the union when it comprised both On-

tario and Quebec. And a province may have full autonomy, partial autonomy or no distinct autonomy at all. Hence the measure or degree of its autonomy cannot mark or alter its date of admission into the union.

To come back again to Mr. Calder's query, there were no separate schools in the Northwest province at the union. The Privy Council will say so, and Sir Wilfrid Laurier knows it if Mr. Scott and Mr. Calder do not! That is why the party "machine" was called into requisition, and is now being overworked in the attempt to shackle Alberta and Saskatchewan.

No. VI

A STATUORY LIE.

We should like, before leaving this question of date, to relieve Mr. Calder's anxiety. We do not expect from him an open admission of conversion, but we imagine that he is almost persuaded. It is very evident that the matter of the true date of "union" perplexed him sorely when writing his pamphlet. On pages 7 and 8 he discusses the probability of an argument concerning Sept. 1st, 1905 as the date of the "union with Canada." He calls aloud and asks: What actual rights and privileges would they (the separatists) have on that date? He answers his own query in these significant words: **NO ONE KNOWS, AND NO ONE WILL EVER KNOW UNLESS THE MATTER IS DECIDED BY THE PRIVY COUNCIL.** Mark particularly that these are Mr. Calder's words—not ours. Why

does the Minister of Education seek to preserve that condition of doubt and indecision? Evidently he deems that ignorance is bliss. If not, why does he object to a reference of all the disputed points to the Privy Council at once?

Now, Mr. Calder, we shall not prolong your painful suspense, but a few moments more on this question of date. Just turn to the Hansard of 1901. Look up March 25th of that year, and follow the budget debate until you find the name **WALTER SCOTT**, (West Assiniboia). There you will find the words of your leader, counsellor and patronizing political god-father, reading thus: **ON THE 15TH OF JULY, 1870, THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES WERE ADMITTED INTO CONFEDERATION, AND BECAME PART AND PARCEL OF THE DOMINION.**

What more do you want? Are you convinced? There is just one avenue of escape from this opinion, if you prefer the other view. Let us whisper; it is this: Point to the fact that the words were uttered four years ago, and argue that a Scott opinion does not last that long. No one will attempt to dispute—not even your opponent, Mr. James B. Hawkes.

Yet, still, there is no escape Mr. Calder. You are caught again in another mesh of this net. So satisfied were your fellow coercionists in Parliament that 1870 was the true date of "the union" that they made an arbitrary provision changing it to Sept. 1st of this year. A clause in the Autonomy Act, says:

And where the expression "at the union" is employed in said sub-section 3, it shall be held to mean the date at which this act comes into force.

The coercionists knowing full well that no separate schools existed prior to 1870, invented and enacted a STATUTORY LIE so as to deprive the new provinces of the EXCLUSIVE RIGHT which the British Parliament conferred upon all the provinces by virtue of Section 93 of the B. N. A. Act. In other words the coercionists have deliberately undertaken to force a meaning of their own into Section

93, in contradiction of its intent, as well as of its effect in the other provinces. Could brazen-faced tyranny go any further? And Walter Scott, who had no doubt in 1901 as to the real date of the union, voted in 1905 for the fixing of an arbitrary date which is a deliberate falsehood on the face of it! Why did he do it? In order that Section 93 might have a different meaning, and a different application in Saskatchewan and Alberta from what it has in Manitoba and British Columbia. The hierarchy demanded it, and the thing had to be done. Violent hands were laid upon the shield which Great Britain gave to each province, and the will of a foreign potentate becomes law in its stead. The ancient right of appeal which has long been the boast of the humblest British subject is denied. Mr. Scott is dubbed "Premier" and sent back to make Saskatchewan swallow both the insult and the injury.

The people, we fear, have not yet awakened to a proper realization of the cold-blooded and cruel wrong that is being perpetrated upon them. Voters, take time to read, to look and to think. Exercise the grand gift of reason, and we have no fear as to your decision. Truth is mighty and it must prevail.

No. VII.

BALD FACTS PLAINLY PRESENTED.

In number 5 of his categorical inquiries, Mr. Calder seems to lay special stress on the fact that mention is made of Chapters 29 and 30 of the Territorial ordinances, in section 17 of the Autonomy Act, which reads as follows:

In and for the Province of Saskatchewan, the Legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provision: Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or

privilege with respect to separate schools which any class of persons have at the date of the passing of this Act, under the terms of Chapters 29 and 30 of the ordinances of the Northwest Territories, passed in the year 1901, or with respect to religious instruction in any public or separate schools as provided for in the said ordinances.

Chapter 29 is the Territorial School Ordinance, and Chapter 30 the Schools Assessment Ordinance. One would almost imagine by the amount of stress laid upon this reference that the ordinances aforesaid had become part of the Autonomy Act—in fact, that is the false and misleading impression that some campaigners are trying to create. We should suppose, however, that an intending minister of education would be above such deception. It would be but a matter of justice to himself that he should contradict and set right any ignorant or misguided individual whom he might chance to hear setting forth the claim that our present school law is perpetuated by the Autonomy Act. It is surely bad enough—too bad, that the Federal power should foist the separate system upon us, but it would be simply preposterous to say that the Dominion Parliament could establish or had established two of our ordinances as law forever and ever! It is impossible! What the Dominion Parliament has done or has tried to do is to perpetuate the separate school features contained in Chapters 29 and 30. They do not mention any clause specifically. They only say that the privileges cannot be PREJUDICIALLY affected. They may be enlarged and extended, but they must not be curtailed in the least. So says the coercion act,

which Mr. Scott delights to dignify with the name "constitution." But right here again we catch Mr. Calder stooping to tricks that are vain, though nevertheless mean, because they are deceptive and altogether beneath a gentleman of his aspirations. On page 8 of his pamphlet he says:

"It was, therefore, for the express purpose of clearing away all doubts, and of providing for the continuation of the existing system, that the Western Liberal members of Parliament insisted upon defining and naming the laws in which the system was to be found and described."

Keeping in view the foregoing citation we now challenge and defy Mr. Calder to say on his honor as a man credited with some degree of intelligence, and aspiring to the headship of educational affairs, that the Autonomy Act secures the continuation of the present School Ordinances. He knows that it does not. He knows that the first Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan can pull the present School Ordinances to pieces, so long as their amendments do not PREJUDICIALLY affect separate schools. Why, in the face of that knowledge, does he attempt to leave the impression that Western Liberals in Parliament secured for Saskatchewan the "continuation" of something that clears away "all doubt"? Is the minister capable of such petty trickery?

Ah, what a devious web we weave
When first we practice to deceive

Mr. Calder did not, of course originate the subtle concoction. He is merely shoving it along—playing his part, so to speak. The artful dodge was devised in the midst of a dilemma. During the Siftonian panic of last session the Western Liberal members stood aghast

for several days. They were awe-stricken. To them the Autonomy bill at first looked good. But when Sifton got home from his profractured pleasure trip in the south, he read the bill once—twice—and then—he bolted. The prairie was afire sure enough. Liberal associations were resoluting and telegraphing congratulations to Sifton. Sir Wilfrid was sulking, and Sbarretti and Fitzpatrick were obdurate. The strain was terrible and something had to be done. The Free Press, with prophetic intuition, gave the reassuring intimation that whatever satisfied Mr. Sifton would be satisfactory to the entire west. Everybody got busy drafting compromise clauses, but nothing could be devised that was suitable alike to Mr. Sifton, the bolter, and Mr. Fitzpatrick, author of the coercion clauses and confidant of the clerics. At length the idea of citing Chapters 29 and 30, and substituting these titles for the words "by law" arose in some mind, and was immediately seized upon as a happy thought. Fitzpatrick approved readily, for his astute legal discernment told him at a glance that the substitution did not alter the situation in the slightest degree, except that the citation could be used as a means to lull the Western people into believing that the present law was being confirmed in perpetuity. Mr. Sifton also saw the sham of it all, but other circumstances compelled him to give a sort of tacit consent. It was indeed a tragic scene, when the man who had come to be regarded as "master of the administration," and to whom all Canada was looking, at that crucial moment, stood before Parliament and confessed in faltering tones the utter lack of enthusiasm, yea, the gnawing re-

luctance with which he supported an accursed compromise. Why he did it is another story. But even then his conviction could not be suppressed, for he said:

"I am here to say that you cannot deal with abuses of that kind with kid gloves. I am here to say that if there is anything in my public life I am proud of, it is the fact that I was one of those who helped to abolish that system of education in Manitoba."

What system? What abuses? The very system just then under discussion; the system which by reluctant vote, though dissenting voice, he was at that moment helping to fasten upon Saskatchewan and Alberta.

One fact standing out in bold relief is that the compromise did not satisfy Mr. Sifton. Then how can it satisfy the Western people? Let the Free Press answer. Mr. Scott is satisfied and so is Mr. Calder and some others. But Mr. Sifton is far from satisfied. He knew that the so-called amendments were not amendments but a play upon words to delude and ensnare honest people, who would be slow to suspect or believe their representatives capable of such rank duplicity.

The doubts of the people have not, then, been cleared away. On the contrary the suspicions of even the most confiding ones are now thoroughly aroused. Kid gloves are discarded and buck-mitted, leather-booted yeomen are daily growing more eager for the fray. On election day they will abolish the "abuses," and thereby accomplish in 1905 what their compatriots in Manitoba accomplished in 1896.

THE CLOAK TORN OFF.

The Regina Leader, Mr. Scott's personal organ, has published the examination paper which we gave in No. 2 of this series. Commenting on that rankly sectarian set of questions for school teachers, The Leader says :

"The Ordinance under which such an examination paper was issued, was abolished 14 years ago."

This is the proverbial half-truth, which is worse than the whole lie. The ordinance itself has been changed, but the separate school clause, as taken from the Northwest Act, was retained (had to be retained) in all our school ordinances, and is to be found on page 12, of our present ordinance, section 41.

"Under Chapter 29, of 1901, such an examination paper is prohibited"—says The Leader.

False again. We challenge The Leader to produce proof of the alleged prohibition, or stand convicted of uttering a deliberate falsehood for the very obvious purpose of deceiving its readers. Either that or The Leader is profoundly ignorant concerning the entire subject. The latter is the more charitable view, but the former is the more probable.

We are sorry that the circumstances demand a retort so pointed, but the entire article shows deception in almost every line. For instance it is alleged that "Mr. Haultain refuses to accept Chapter 29 as the schools constitution of Saskatchewan, and demands its extinction from the Saskatchewan Act." We repeat that Chapter 29 is not the "schools constitution"

of Saskatchewan, any more than Chapter 80 is the stray animals constitution, or Chapter 85 the wild duck and prairie chicken constitution of Saskatchewan. Clause 16 provides that all our ordinances remain in force until our own new legislature makes necessary changes. But the one exception always remains. They cannot PREJUDICIALLY affect the separate school privileges forced upon us in 1875, and still remaining in the law as Section 41 of Chapter 29.

The Leader should understand that the questions on the Roman Catholic examination papers are the best possible indication as to the kind of religious instruction the church desires to have taught, and is now teaching at public expense. Section 137 of Chapter 29 permits the inculcation of purely sectarian doctrine, such as papal infallibility, extreme unction, etc., during the last half hour, by the licensed school teachers of Saskatchewan. If this is proper, is it not equally right that the teachers should pass an examination in these subjects? If the duty of promulgating papal doctrine is to be imposed upon state-paid teachers, should not the state see to their qualification in that subject as well as in algebra, and geometry? And will not the papal authorities upon whom Mr. Scott and Mr. Calder are now depending demand that quid pro quo? Mr. Calder, as Minister of Education, will have the power to grant it, under Section 6 of Chapter 29, which gives the minister full and unrestricted authority to make all regulations respect-

ing classification, organization, administration, holding office by EXAMINATION and inspection of kind permission of the Sbaretti- all schools. Laurier combination, during the

And yet The Regina Leader, good pleasure of the twain, who speaking for Mr. Scott and Mr. are meeting with such unqualified Calder, has the impudent hardi- success, and enlisting such distin- hood to say that an examination guished support in their efforts to paper, such as we published, would establish firmly and forever a state be impossible under a Scott-Calder church in Canada.

NO. IX.

ORIGINAL CLAUSE RETAINED.

Having reviewed the circum- school ordinances in the days of stances under which the reference Governors Mackintosh, Royal, to Chapters 29 and 30 was brought into the Autonomy bill, and hav- Dewdney, we still find this ubiq- ing shown that the only possible tuous separate school clause.

We now turn to the Dominion effect of it is the preservation of Act, which first gave us Territor- the separate school features, we ial organization, best-known as the N.W.T. Act, 1875. There we shall now proceed to examine the read :

minority privileges guaranteed under the provisions of the aforesaid ordinances. Turning to page 12, of the Territorial School Ordinance of 1881, we read :

Sec. 41—The minority of the ratepayers in any district, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic may establish a separate school therein; and in such case the ratepayers establishing such separate school shall be liable only to assessments of such rates as they impose upon themselves in respect thereof.

Where did Mr. Haultain find that provision when framing the act? Let us trace back a little. Here is the "Consolidated Ordinances 1898." Turn up "Schools," page 690, Section 35. Ah, here we have the same thing :

The minority of the ratepayers . . . whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish a separate school therein, etc.

Look to the Ordinance of 1890, and there it is again, Sec. 35. And thus tracing back through all our

Section 11. - When and as soon as any system of taxation shall be adopted in any district or portion of the Northwest Territories the lieutenant governor, by and with the consent of the council or assembly, as the case may be, shall pass all necessary ordinances in respect to education, but it shall therein be always provided that a majority of the ratepayers of any district or portion of the Northwest Territories, or any lesser portion or subdivision thereof, by whatever name the same may be known, may establish such schools therein as they may think fit, and make the necessary assessment and collection of rates therefor : AND FURTHER THAT THE MINORITY OF THE RATEPAYERS THEREIN, WHETHER PROTESTANT OR ROMAN CATHOLICS, MAY ESTABLISH SEPARATE SCHOOLS THEREIN, and in such latter case, the rate-

payers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools shall be liable only to assessments of such rates as they may impose upon themselves in respect thereof.

What does this prove? It shows that our Territorial legislators have simply followed out the imperious command of the Dominion Act of 1875, and copied its separate school clause into each and every school ordinance ever since. That fact being now clearly demonstrated, how can Mr. Calder or Mr. Scott or anyone else maintain that any advantage has been gained

on either side by the citing of Chapters 29 and 30 in the Autonomy Act? Would not the very same legal effect be obtained by going back to the original, and citing the latter portion of Section 11 of the Dominion Act 1875? O, but, says Mr. Calder, everybody is satisfied with the way it has been "working out" under Mr. Haultain. Yes, surely! But why try to make it appear that the "system" has changed? Why not have the manly honor to admit that any difference which has been felt or shown in the operating of our schools has been the result of Mr. Haultain's wise administration?

No. X.

SIFTON, SCOTT AND HAULTAIN.

Much stress is laid upon the assumption that because the Dominion Government imposed the separate school system upon the Northwest in 1875, we are bound to perpetuate that system. And yet many of those who argue in that direction must know that it is a fallacy. If Sir Wilfrid Laurier believed it, why did he go to the very great trouble of making specific provision in the Autonomy Act for the maintenance and continuance of that system? If Section 11 of the N.W.T. Act, 1875, brought us within the scope of Section 93, sub-sec. 1 of the B.N.A. Act of 1867, why was it necessary to pass Section 17 of the Autonomy Act in 1905? Why were not the existing laws left to their operation, as Mr. Borden proposed? The best answer, the real and only answer is found in the enactment itself, which fixes an arbitrary date of union and an arbitrary interpretation clause.

No extraordinary intelligence is

required to see and understand that the Imperial Parliament in protecting minority rights existing "at the union" could only have in view such minority rights as had been conferred voluntarily by the uniting province itself. Mr. Scott, speaking in the House of Commons on March 25th, 1901, remarked very truly that "entire equality is the only sure guarantee of the permanency of the Confederation structure." What sort of equality does he now deem it that gave all the older provinces liberty to choose their own school systems, and imposes the separate system upon the new provinces? Does not that give the Confederation structure a rude shock? Mr. Scott also, in 1901, advocated the placing of the people of the Territories in a position which would be "entirely equal, and in no way inferior to the position which is occupied by the citizens of any other province of Canada." Can it be possible that the Mr. Scott who

offered these patriotic sentiments in 1901 is the same who is a candidate for the premiership of a new province that has by his own aid, been placed in a position of inferiority and humiliation?

Mr. Scott, in the speech above quoted said further: "I may say that what the people of the Territories expect, and what I think they have a right to expect, is that they will be dealt with on exactly the same basis as the originally confederated provinces **DEALT WITH THEMSELVES**, and be put in exactly the same position as that occupied by the originally confederated provinces." That is exactly what we all thought. That was what Mr. Sifton thought, and he has not yet changed his mind, though he voted for the bill, in order to avert a crisis. Speaking in the House of Commons just as he was about to cast a vote that was an insult to his own intelligence, as well as an outrage upon every voter who had supported him, Mr. Sifton said:

"From my standpoint I may say that inasmuch as the new territories are not a free community, inasmuch as the ordinances are ordinances passed under a special and limited power, therefore when they come into the family of provinces, we ought not to apply to them the principle of preserving

the status quo, because the status quo was not brought about by their own unlimited powers." In plainer words the contention of Mr. Sifton is that the new provinces should not be held responsible, by the Federal power, for a state or condition which the Federal power itself had imposed; or, to put it in Mr. Scott's words, that the new provinces should be free to deal with themselves as the originally confederated provinces had dealt with themselves. Here are two men, both of them prominent in the ranks of the Liberal party, and both of them supporting the same measure. Note the difference in attitude. The one (Mr. Sifton), supporting the bill apologetically and with confessed reluctance, and to that extent with consistency; the other accepts it with professed delight, and expects his astounding inconsistency to be rewarded with public approbation and preferment.

We now see that Sifton, Scott and Haultain each possessed the same opinions at the start, respecting Provincial Rights. How do we find them at the finish? Mr. Sifton swallows his convictions with a wry and sorrowful countenance. Mr. Scott's task was much easier, for principles he had none! He had only to eat his own words, turn a somersault on the stage, and pose for the applause of the gallery.

No. XI.

THE SYSTEMS IN CONTRAST.

In one of the early numbers of this series, we promised to revert to the unfortunate manner in which Sir Wilfrid Laurier, when introducing the autonomy bill, went out of his way to make an attack upon the national school system—an attack that was not warranted

either by the circumstances or the facts, as we shall shortly show. Sir Wilfrid said:

"When I compare Canada and the United States, when I compare the statutes of the two nations, when I think upon their future, when I observe the social

condition of the civil society in tury intellectuality, and fills our each of them, and when I ob- jails and penitentiaries? serve in this country of ours, a The illiterates of the entire Dom- total absence of lynchings, and inion, including the aboriginal almost total absence of divorces tribes, number 24.63 of the popula- and murders, for my part, I tion. In Quebec, with its three thank high heaven that we are centuries of clerical domination, living in a country where the the illiterates are 29.02 per cent; young of the land are taught And Sir Wilfrid is thankful, and Christian morals and Christian proceeds in high ecstasy to make dogmas. Either the American odious comparisons against the system is right or the Canadian United States, where an hetero- system is right. They cannot geneous population, drawn from all both be right." quarters of the globe, has been

What does Sir Wilfrid mean by blended, under the national school the "Canadian" system? Evident- system, into an American citizen- ly he has reference to the Quebec ship that, for enterprise and intel- system, and overlooks the fact that ligence, challenges the admiration the American, or non-sectarian of the entire civilized world!

system is the one that prevails in the majority of provinces—is, in Quebec became a British colony truth, the one guaranteed under in 1763. Forty years later, the the B.N.A. Act. Having the two United States acquired by pur- systems thus working side byside chase from France the vast, do- in our own Dominion, why did Sir main west of the Mississippi, and Wilfrid go so far afield to make known as Louisiana. In far less comparisons? Why did he not than a century, the French popu- compare the criminal records of lation of the latter became thor- those portions of Canada wherein oughly assimilated with that of dogmas are taught at public cost, the other states. But in Canada, with the criminal records of Quebec has remained in many re- provinces in which the time of the spects, as distinctively French as teachers is devoted entirely to the it was 150 years ago. And why? ordinary branches of learning? Because the Quebec Act of 1774 re- Johnson's Year Book for 1904, pub- stored the French civil law, estab- lished by the Government, would lished a state church, and to all have shown him that the propor- intents and purposes created a tion of criminals in the former is newer France on British soil, greater by exactly thirty-three per cent. The same authority would

have shown Sir Wilfrid that Que- bec, in which his so-called "Cana- dian" system has fullest sway, is the most illiterate of all Eastern Provinces. Is it not, then, a hol- low mockery for the Premier of Canada to thank high heaven for a system which, while it inculcates Coercionists or the Provincial veneration for saints and obedience Righters that are trying to pro- to foreign potentates, retards the mote and conduct a campaign of forward march or twentieth cen- deceit.

QUEBEC MAGNANIMITY.

The fact that the Protestant minority in Quebec have separate school privileges is often pointed out as an argument in favor of the system, and as evidence of magnanimity on the part of the majority in that province. The argument is utterly fallacious and altogether discordant to the facts. In Quebec the schools were distinctly French and Roman Catholic from the beginning. They were under the direct control of the church. The teachers were in holy "orders"; crucifixes and saintly pictures adorned the walls, and religious exercises constituted the major part of the daily program. Protestant children had to take that course or go uneducated. This condition made it imperative that a system of minority schools, which are the real public schools of that province, should be established. But no such necessity as that is imposed upon a Roman Catholic minority anywhere in Canada. If Protestant majorities flaunted Protestant emblems in the face of Catholic children, and dinned Protestant prayers and Protestant dogmas into their ears, with Protestant clerics as teachers, the cases would be parallel, and the separate school system would be an absolute necessity. But Protestant majorities do not exercise such power, nor arrogate to themselves such privileges. On the contrary they stand for the entire separation of church and state, and for the fullest denominational equality before the law. And they stand for the national school system as the only system adapted to mixed communities.

The Quebec system is the one which the Autonomy Act seeks to

establish in Saskatchewan. This is quite clear, notwithstanding any pledges or pretences which Messrs. Scott and Calder may advance. Sir Wilfrid gave it all away when he compared the systems and pointed with affectation of pride to the treatment accorded by the majority to the minority in that province. Let the Huntingdon Gleaner, a leading Quebec paper, tell us what the magnanimous treatment of which Sir Wilfrid is so proud really amounts to. It says:—

"Do men flee a province where they have no cause of complaint? I am not going to enumerate all their causes for complaint, I select one, and that one on which Sir Wilfrid makes his boast—that of schools. Farmers have told the writer, when he remonstrated with them for selling out, that they had no choice, that when the ratepayers were all of one mind in their district, they had only strength enough to keep up one school, but when the Cure interfered, and insisted on a separate school, they could not maintain one. The alternative was before them to see their children grow up in ignorance or go to a country where there were no separate schools. They were doing well in the Province of Quebec, they did not expect to get farms of better soil, it was a wrench to their feelings to break old associations and part with old neighbors; but for the sake of their children they felt they must make the sacrifice. This is the fruit of separate schools. If we had national schools no child in the province would be without opportunity to learn to read and write. Another conse-

quence of these sectarian schools should never be lost sight of, and that is, where Protestant farmers are too few to have a school, they are taxed to support Catholic schools, which sometimes have as their teachers nuns or Christian brothers. There are hundreds of Protestant farmers who are forced either to support Catholic schools or sell out. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who, as Premier, ought to be the guardian of the rights that pertain to every British subject, regardless of creed or nationality, tells us it is no cause of complaint to compel Protestants to pay taxes to support a religious system against which their very name indicates they protest, and that is the system of schools he wants to fasten for all time on our great Northwest. There is not a Protestant farmer who has been under the thrall in Quebec, who would want to buy land in the proposed new provinces if he succeeds."

Despite Premier Scott's weakling protestations, we repeat that the object of the hierarchy is made plain by Sir Wilfrid. They would rejoice to see the French and English-speaking peoples kept apart in the west as they have been in the east. In further proof of this we may quote Bishop Clouthier of Three Rivers, Quebec, who, during the early stages of the autonomy debate, said:—

"We must have Federal legislation that will guarantee to the minority the right to have schools of their own choosing, both as regards religion and language. The object which a certain number of people have in view in establishing so-called national schools, tends to stamp with the same im-

print every citizen of this country.

"Now, this fusion of races, as far as the French-Canadians are concerned, is a dream, an utopia; for it would mean the renouncing of their providential mission."

Thus we have the testimony of Premier Laurier and of a leading Roman Catholic Bishop that perpetual separation, a never-ending national cleavage is the purport of the separate school clauses in the Saskatchewan bill. There must be no common imprint of citizenship. We must be French and English forever. That may seem right to the French-Canadian Prime Minister and to the French-Canadian Bishop, having in view the fulfilment of some "providential mission"; but what shall we say of Protestant politicians and Protestant voters, who, for the sake of temporary gain or aggrandizement, become the willing tools of those whose avowed aims are contrary to the progressive enlightenment of the present age, and would not be tolerated in old France, Spain or Italy!

The Standard, in common with many others, cherished for some years the bright hope that the providential mission of Sir Wilfrid Laurier was to put the imprint of a common Canadian nationality upon his countrymen. When he successfully fought the hierarchy on the issues of the Manitoba school question, it seemed as if the right man had arisen at the right time and place, to put the habitation on a footing of independent and intelligent citizenship. The outlook for a united Canada going forward to manifest destiny among the nations looked bright indeed. Citizens of every rank and station,

of every race and creed cheered for the French-Canadian Roman Catholic statesman, who was leading his compatriots towards complete emancipation, and the whole country to progress and prosperity. Can we wonder that with such a hope held steadfastly to their view, the relapse of Sir Wilfrid came as a bitter disappointment to many thousands of his most admiring supporters? Can we wonder that a panic was created and that all the genius of a selfish political aggregation was taxed to prevent a crisis? Can we wonder that Liberal association protested, and that thousands of the best and truest Liberals in Saskatchewan have joined hands with other followers of Mr. Haultain, and are today fighting the battle of the West under the Provincial Rights banner? And can we wonder that Haultain was deposed from the Premiership and Walter Scott called by Gov. Forger at the request of Sir Wilfrid to aid in the accomplishment of the "providential mission" of extending French dominance, both as to "language and religion" throughout Western Canada?

One very reassuring feature is the very evident fact that Mr. Scott is finding the task more difficult than he at all anticipated. To contribute our quota towards his defeat is our duty as we see it. We gave Mr. Scott fair, friendly and timely warning, and we are in no way responsible for his plight. We utterly disclaim any unfriendliness towards him personally even now, though we are free to admit that the conditions and incidents of the campaign have not enhanced the esteem in which we had held him. Our feeling, however, is one of astonishment rather than resentment, except in so far as re-

sentment, opposition and exposure become matters of plain duty.

The Standard is not attacking any religious system as such. Religion, after all, is largely a matter of chance to most of us. The great majority of civilized mankind adhere through life to the religious denomination into which they were born. The Standard has been far too closely associated with Roman Catholics to fail to observe many excellencies in their religious system. We make no distinction between them and other denominations of believers or unbelievers in matters of business or of social intercourse. It has been a life-time pleasure to the writer to count in the ranks of the Roman Catholic church some of his truest and best friends. The public school system brought us into intimacy with them in our early years, and we discovered that they were like ourselves—just human. As we pen these lines memory sweeps back to the old Central Academy where the stern but warm-hearted Irish-Catholic domine, Edward Roche, unfolded the mysteries of mathematics to Protestant and Catholic boys, who, in their keen rivalry for learning, thought not of denominational distinction, but felt a common pride in the teacher and the school. Under such conditions as these do the boys of the maritime provinces obtain the imprint of broad citizenship, and lay foundations for the success which many of them achieve at home and abroad. Shall the youth of Saskatchewan be less favored, or will we secure for them the rights which the British Parliament placed within their reach? Will you permit craven politicians to rob your children of a birthright?

To us, as to Protestants in general, the objectionable feature of Roman Catholicism is the hierarchical assumption of temporal power, and the constant endeavor to usurp functions which, in all free countries, are entirely and essentially secular. Such usurpation is utterly incompatible with civil progress, and in the interests of ALL THE PEOPLE it must be combatted and checked in Canada, as has already been done by the people of the most Catholic countries of Europe.

I am deeply conscious of the harm which may come to me and mine by reason of my stand in the present contest, but—

"Simple duty knows no fear."

I have not changed on the question. I am now where I have always been, and where I hope always to be, on the issue as between democracy and ecclesiasticism. I have written these articles word for word, and have compiled and published this pamphlet at my own cost, in the hope that it may in some measure offset the specious arguments that are advanced by government organs and speakers to lure earnest

and honest electors into misconception of the real situation. In conclusion, dear reader, I most earnestly solicit the veto of your vote upon a daring, a cold-blooded and carefully premeditated attempt to despoil a fair province of its constitutional rights and to propagate principles that are at once subversive of individual liberty and a menace to our most cherished institutions.

Yours faithfully,

J. K. McINNIS,

Editor and Publisher The Standard
Regina, Saskatchewan,

November 15th, 1905.

"Think, and let think," "Live, and let live," and thereby cultivate and promote a sturdy self-reliant manhood that will stand for justice to all and special favors to none—these are the guiding principles of THE REGINA STANDARD.

If you are not already a regular reader, you are earnestly invited to join our circle.

Daily, 8 pages - \$3.00 a year.

Semi-Weekly, 8 pages, \$1.00 "

Weekly, 16 pages - \$1.00 "